

**STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois	}	
	}	
Petition for a Certificate of Public Convenience	}	
and Necessity, pursuant to Section 8-406.1 of	}	
the Illinois Public Utilities Act, and an Order	}	
pursuant to Section 8-503 of the Public Utilities	}	Case No.: 12-0598
Act, to Construct, Operate and Maintain a New	}	
High Voltage Electric Service Line and Related	}	
Facilities in the Counties of Adams, Brown, Cass,	}	
Champaign, Christian, Clark, Coles, Edgar,	}	
Fulton, Macon, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie,	}	
Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, and Shelby,	}	
Illinois.	}	

**DIRECT TESTIMONY ON REHEARING
OF
STEVEN J. LAZORCHAK, P.E., CEM**

Intervenor MSSCLPG Exhibit 12.0

1 **DIRECT TESTIMONY ON REHEARING OF STEVEN J. LAZORCHAK, P.E., CEM**

2 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS.**

3 A. Steven J. Lazorchak. 15322 Buckley Road, Marion, Illinois 62959.

4 **Q. WITH REFERENCE TO WHAT HAS BEEN MARKED INTERVENOR MSSCLPG**
5 **EXHIBIT 12.1, DOES THIS TRULY AND CORRECTLY REFLECT YOUR**
6 **BACKGROUND, INCLUDING EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND**
7 **EXPERIENCE, AS IT MIGHT RELATE TO RENDERING AN EXPERT OPINION**
8 **IN THIS CASE?**

9 A. Yes it does.

10 **Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE PROCEEDING IN WHICH YOU ARE**
11 **PRESENTING THIS TESTIMONY?**

12 A. Yes I am. I was contacted by an attorney, Edward D. McNamara, Jr., who represents the
13 intervenor collecting known as the Morgan, Sangamon, and Scott Counties Land
14 Preservation Group. He asked that I review the record to date and I proceeded to do so, with
15 particular emphasis paid to the portion of the proposed project which travels between
16 Meredosia and Pawnee, Illinois.

17 **Q. FOR THAT SEGMENT BETWEEN MEREDOSIA AND PAWNEE, ILLINOIS,**
18 **FROM A REVIEW OF THE RECORD TO DATE, DID YOU REACH ANY**
19 **CONCLUSIONS?**

20 A. Yes I did. First, it appears that two routing options are now in contention for that segment
21 between Meredosia and Pawnee, Illinois. Such options have come to be referred to as the
22 Rebuttal Recommended Route and the MSCLTF Route (utilizing an existing 138 kV line

corridor). From a comparison of these two options, it appears that the MSCLTF Route is 18.3 miles shorter than the Rebuttal Recommended Route. It appears that the MSCLTF Route will cost \$36.78 million less to construct than the Rebuttal Recommended Route. It further appears that there is an existing corridor for use in constructing the MSCLTF Route. From a review of the testimony of Staff Witness Greg Rockrohr, Senior Electrical Engineer at the Commission, I concur with Mr. Rockrohr's methodology, when he compared the proposed routes based upon length of the line and the number of dead end structures that would be required. I agree with Mr. Rockrohr that route length and number of dead end structures tend to be the primary cost drivers. By general rule, a route that follows a straight line, is shorter, and will require fewer dead end structures will cost less. As for cost of construction, utilization of the existing 138 kV line corridor will certainly lead to the least cost as it relates to the initial construction.

Q. ARE THERE ANY ADVANTAGES TO UTILIZING THE SHORTER LINE IN TERMS OF HAZARD?

A. Absolutely. The shorter the line, the less chance of lightning strikes, storm, and airborne debris putting the line out of service.

Q. DOES A SHORTER LINE HAVE ANY ADVANTAGES FROM A LINE-LOSS STANDPOINT?

A. Definitely. Less line length equals less impedance. A shorter line is more efficient.

Q. IN COMPARING THE REBUTTAL RECOMMENDED ROUTE TO THE MSCLTF ROUTE, DO YOU FIND ANY OTHER SIGNIFICANT ADVANTAGES OF ONE LINE VERSUS THE OTHER?

45 A. Yes. The MSCLTF Route will require fewer angle structures and will use more tangent
46 structures, thus costing less and generally having much less impact upon the various
47 landowners along the line.

48 **Q. DO YOU HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING AS TO THE RIGHT-OF-WAY THAT**
49 **WILL BE REQUIRED FOR THE PROPOSED 345 kV LINE?**

50 A. Yes I do. It appears that a 150 foot wide right-of-way will be required for the proposed new
51 line and I took this into consideration when I reviewed the matter.

52 **Q. ARE THERE ANY FURTHER FACTORS THAT YOU TOOK INTO**
53 **CONSIDERATION IN ANALYZING THE INITIAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF**
54 **THE ROUTING OPTIONS?**

55 A. Yes there are. In general, if the 138kV corridor has been properly cleared and maintained,
56 the adjacent 345kV corridor should be easier to access and clear. Construction equipment
57 staging and material storage may utilize the existing 138kV corridor. Vehicular/equipment
58 access should be easier along an existing corridor. It is easier to perform vegetation control
59 and line maintenance on the adjacent rights-of-way.

60 **Q. DID YOU FORM AN OPINION AS TO WHICH OF THE TWO ROUTING**
61 **OPTIONS WOULD BE THE LEAST COST OPTION?**

62 A. Yes I did. Based upon the record, there are certain hard facts that simply cannot be ignored.
63 It appears undisputed that selection of the MSCLTF Route would result in a line that is 18.3
64 miles shorter in length. Initial construction costs will be \$36.78 million less for the
65 MSCLTF Route. There would have to be very compelling reasons to ignore these hard facts.
66 I have reviewed the record to date and I do not find any such compelling fact or reason that

67 would argue against the shorter line, the line that will be less costly to construct.

68 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

69 A. Yes, it does.